

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: November 2 and 9, 2006

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Bill Hauser, Dennis Danna, Christine Perron, Mark Hemmerlein, Jon Evans, Kevin Nyhan, Marc Laurin, Darrel Elliot, Charles Hood, Jim Kirouac, Richard Radwanski, Pete Stamnas, Nancy Mayville, Steve Liakos, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Jim McConaha, Linda Wilson, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Harry Kinter, FHWA; Karl Roenke and Jonathan Ruhan, National Forest Service; Bill Barry and Rita Walsh, VHB; Scott Newnan, SEA; Grace Levergood, NHDES; Matt Walsh, City of Concord; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Co.; Joe Grilli and Addie Kim, HNTB; and Mike Johnson, Maine Historical Commission.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

Thursday, November 2, 2006

Bath-Landaff 13427. Participant: Christine Perron.

It was agreed that no architectural or archaeological projects were within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, a no historic properties affect memo was signed.

Sara Long Bridge

A recent storm has impacted the electrical components of the Sara Long Bridge so that the lift span cannot be operated. J. Garvin indicated that the proposed emergency work to repair the span would not have an adverse effect on the overall property.

Bartlett, BRZ-032-1 (09), 14372. Participants: Mark Hemmerlein and Steve Liakos.

Mark Hemmerlein had requested that the NHDHR sign a memo indicating that the removal of the Bartlett High Pratt Truss Bridge was an adverse effect and that mitigation for the loss would be determined later. J. Garvin indicated that NHDHR had not agreed to the bridge's removal and it was not prepared to sign such a memo at the meeting. The NHDHR advocated retention, painting, and interpretation of the bridge. Harry Kinter agreed that the memo was premature, and he was about to send the Advisory Council notification of the project. He stated that NHDHR might also want to notify the Council of its position and request its involvement.

Mark Hemmerlein was asked to prepare a 4(f) to review the alternatives, and send the draft to FHWA. The 4(f) should include an analysis of public comment and a copy of the 65 responses.

NHDHR requested a copy of the 4(f) for its review. H. Kinter stated that Federal Highways was a long way from finalization of the project.

Warren-Benton, X-A000(526), 13209. Participant: Mark Hemmerlein

The effect memo was signed with a federal number. It was agreed that the project did not have an adverse effect on Glencliff, an eligible district. In this area, the project is simply paving the existing paved way. NHDOT agreed to document several sections of the corduroy road if it can be identified. The road will continue to decay, and this effort will capture existing evidence for road's manner of construction.

Alstead, X-A000(479), 14541K. Participants: Jon Evans and Bob Landry.

Jon Evans began by explaining that this project involves repairs to the rigid frame bridge over the Cold River near the intersection of NH Route 123 and 12A in downtown Alstead. The backfill behind the southern abutment was washed out as a result of the floods. This caused the entire abutment to drop approximately 1 foot creating several structural and safety concerns. This project will repair any damage done during the floods and reconstruct the temporary repairs to the southern approach.

J. Evans explained that the project would require the construction of longer wing walls to help protect the structure during future events. These wing wall extensions will require the Department to acquire or obtain permanent easements on all four quadrants of the structure. The library (southwestern quadrant) is either eligible for or currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The town owns portions of the northwestern quadrant that are not within NHDOT's ROW. The northeastern quadrant (commonly referred to as the Marx-Wood property) contains a former foundry, potentially eligible for the register.

The southeastern quadrant contains two parcels, both owned by the Town of Alstead. Parcel 203 formerly contained a structure, which was removed several years prior to the floods. This parcel is located adjacent to the bridge and contains the majority of the necessary acquisitions/easements for this quadrant. Parcel 202 is also owned by the Town and contains minimal temporary and permanent easements. Contained within this parcel is both the Millot Green recreational park and the Town Hall. This property received LWCF funds to reconstruct the park after the floods.

Linda Wilson and Harry Kinter stated that impacts to both the library property and the Marx-Wood property made this project an adverse effect on both historic resources and therefore would require full 4(f) documentation. Bill O'Donnell felt that that 4(f) impacts to the recreational facility would qualify for a de minimis finding, however 6(f) impacts would need to be coordinated through DRED. Bob Landry stated that both the northeastern and western quadrants would be possible mitigation sites for the recreational 4(f).

Jon indicated that the current plan was to lump this project into the same document as the Alstead 14540M, 14540W and 14541J documents. Harry and Bill felt that the 14540K project should be a separate document given that a de minimis finding would be sought in the Mill Hollow Historic District of the 14540M project.

Steve Boyington added that the current bridge spans approximately 60% of the bank full width in this area. The river restoration plan and DES have recommended that if possible this span be

expanded to 1.5 times the bank full width. This would require replacement of the bridge rather than rehabilitation and would require additional impacts at each quadrant. Linda and Harry stated that replacement of the bridge would not be a problem as it is not eligible for the register and that although not ideal, the increased area of impacts would likely not adversely increase the impacts beyond the rehabilitation alternative.

It was agreed by all that the 14540K project would stand alone, as it has “stand alone utility,” in a separate environmental document and that the adverse effect on historic resources would be mitigated by the preparation of a modified HAER document and definition of the boundaries of the Alstead Village district in a limited district area form. E. Feighner did not find archaeologically sensitive locations in the project area because of the changes in the landscape caused by the flooding.

Alstead 14540W (no federal number). Participants: Jon Evans and Bob Landry.

Jon Evans began by indicating that this project involves the reconstruction of NH Route 123A from NH Route 123 north to Vilas Pool. Temporary easements will be maintained for work around Vilas Pool, however the existing ROW will be maintained and no additional permanent easements or acquisitions are anticipated. This project will be partially funded by FEMA rather than FHWA. In addition to Vilas Pool, the one property on the western side of the roadway is potentially historic. Also, the Alstead Village district likely extends to encompass Vilas Pool. Vilas Pool has also received LWCF money in the past and therefore impacts to this property will also have 6(f) involvement.

J. McKay and E. Feighner indicated that just below the dam there was an old mill located within the roadbed. The foundation can be seen extending from the bank of the river. It was requested that during construction archaeological monitoring be conducted. Bob Landry indicated that given the limited funding for this section of roadway, the geometries would not be significantly altered and therefore the mill structure would be left in place to the extent that it does not impede upon the reconstruction of the slope below the dam.

Given that the existing ROW will be maintained, it was agreed by all that this project would have no adverse effect upon historic properties and that monitoring would be undertaken.

Alstead, X-A000(425), 14540M and Alstead X-A000(473), 14541J. Participants: Jon Evans, Kevin Nyhan, and Bob Landry.

Kevin Nyhan and Jon Evans began by explaining that these projects involve the reconstruction of the remaining sections of NH Route 123 that had not been addressed in the two earlier projects (14541I, 14541H) or in the previously discussed 14541K and 14540W projects. Two historic districts have been identified within the limits of both projects.

The first district is the Mill Hollow Historic District, located along the eastern end of the project. The majority of the work in this area will be located within the existing ROW with minor improvements to roadway geometry. Bob Landry indicated that an overflow structure is being designed to help protect the Hancock property (parcel 6) by adding extra capacity and preventing water from overflowing onto the road during future flood events and potentially damaging the Hancock’s property. The Hancock property is potentially eligible for the National Register of

Historic Places. Impacts to the Mill Hollow Historic District will be minor strip takes or easements and will be mitigated by the installation of the overflow structure that will protect buildings in the district.

L. Wilson and J. Garvin asked where the outlet of the overflow structure would be located. B. Landry indicated that the outlet would be located along a riprap slope downstream from the dam in a previously disturbed location. The outlet will be placed as far down the slope as possible to help dissipate the energy of the water prior to entering Warren Brook. Vibration monitoring during construction was requested for adjacent historic properties. Bob Landry agreed that this request would be included in the project as an environmental commitment. It was noted that there were a blacksmith shop and barn across NH Route 123 from the mill. Depending on where the culvert is placed on that side, there may be some archaeological remains that require examination. Further coordination on this issue will be needed.

The second historic district is the Alstead Village Historic District, whose boundaries have not yet been defined, located at the easternmost end of the 14540J project. The majority of the work in this area will be located within the existing ROW with minor improvements to roadway geometry. This project will also include relocation of the roadway to the east of the NH Route 12A/Griffin Hill Road intersections as well as realignment of this intersection to improve roadway geometry. Given the previous disturbances in this area E. Feighner agreed that archaeology would be of concern only in the Mill Hollow District, depending on the extent of impact. In this case, NHDOT would need to complete all necessary phases of archaeological investigations.

Both projects contain scattered properties potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic places. As the existing ROW will be maintained throughout the majority of both projects except as explained above, it was agreed by all that both projects would qualify for a No Adverse Effect with a de minimus finding. The Alstead Village Historic District will have its boundaries defined as mitigation for the Alstead, 14541K project.

Hinsdale, X-A000(426), 14540N. Participants: Jon Evans and Bob Landry.

Jon Evans began by giving an overview of the project. The project involves the reconstruction of NH Route 63 that was damaged during the floods of October 9, 2005. Floodwaters in adjacent Kilburn Brook undermined the roadway causing the collapse of a large section of northbound travel lane and portions of the southbound lane. In order to restore safe passage through this area, a temporary bypass road was constructed immediately following the flood event. The temporary bypass road was erected approximately 20 feet to the west of the former alignment of NH Route 63. The new temporary alignment shifted the roadway outside of the existing Right-of-Way, directly adjacent to an existing private structure individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Given the existing space limitations, acquisition of this property is necessary to safely reconstruct NH Route 63.

J. Evans indicated that J. McKay had identified the approximate boundaries of the Hinsdale Historic District within the project limits and adjacent properties. The entire district has not yet been defined as it extends beyond the project limits. Using these boundaries the district begins between parcels 25 and 26 and extends south towards NH Route 119. It was agreed by all that these limits looked accurate near the project area and that preparation of the environmental document could continue under the assumption that these were the boundaries.

Dalton 14638 (no federal number). Participant: Jon Evans.

Jon Evans began by explaining that this project involves the replacement of a failing 6'± metal culvert beneath NH Route 135 in Dalton with a 14'± Conspan over an unnamed brook within 1/4 mile of the Connecticut River. The hydrology of the site has inadvertently created a pool at the pipe outlet, which local residents use as a swimming hole. A park has also been created on the northern side of the roadway adjacent to the swimming hole.

Bob Aubrey explained that given the topography of the site it was unlikely that the work could be done without closing the road. The detour around this site is significant and therefore the town has requested that closures be limited to the summer months as not to disrupt school bus transportation. B. Aubrey also indicated that the existing ROW would be maintained to the maximum extent practicable.

All agreed that the project would not impact any historic properties and therefore qualifies for a No Historic Properties Affected Memo.

J. Evans asked if there were any archaeological concerns associated with the sites close proximity to the Connecticut River. Given the minimally invasive nature of the project and the fact that the majority of the site is constructed in fill originally associated with creation of the roadway, E. Feighner felt that the project could proceed without concern for archaeological resources.

Epsom (no project number). Participant: Richard Radwanski, NHDOT District 5.

Cumberland Farms has requested a driveway permit from District 5 for a restrict access to Route 4 and full access to Black Hall Road. Cumberland Farms has purchased the Epsom Baptist Church, and a committee of the Town of Epsom is seeking ways and funds to purchase and move the building. E. Feighner asked if other permits, such as a wetlands or storm water pollution plan, were necessary for demolition of the church and the construction of the Cumberland Farms building. L. Wilson stated that if demolition preceded receipt of such necessary permits that would involve Section 106, then Cumberland Farms would be participating in preemptive demolition. The project clearly has an adverse effect on the property. R. Radwanski agreed to approve site access contingent on compliance with other state and federal regulations including Section 106 and RSA 227C.

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C. Participants: Marc Laurin and Pete Stamnas.

P. Stamnas discussed the changes in the design to the I-93 reconstruction in the vicinity of Exit 3 in Windham and its effect on the Robert Armstrong House and George Armstrong House located on Range Road (NH 111A), both of which were to be impacted by the option presented in the FEIS. The proposed alignment is shifted to the west approximately 90 feet to reuse the existing southbound fill. This shift allows the Department to avoid impacts to the George Armstrong House and could possibly eliminate impacts to the Robert Armstrong House. P. Stamnas presented a couple of options: 1. constructing a 2 to 1 slope that would impact the back northern

corner of the Robert Armstrong House, and 2. constructing an MSE wall along the northbound I-93 slope that would provide a 20-foot offset to the House. The MSE wall would be 10 to 12 feet in height and the northbound mainline would be 30 to 35 feet from the House. The travel way of I-93 would be about 20 feet in height from the ground elevation of the House. The Common Man Restaurant would still not be functional as a restaurant, due to the loss in parking and access to the front entrance, but the septic field would still be useable.

A general discussion of the effects to the resources including the advantages and disadvantages of partial versus full acquisition of the property, which includes both Armstrong Houses, and whether to relocate the Robert Armstrong House ensued. Full acquisition would allow the placing of covenants on both houses and they could be resold with covenants in place. Partial acquisition, including purchasing the Robert Armstrong House, may be more desirable to the owner. The Department would need to redo their appraisal and covenants could not be placed on the George Armstrong House, though it would still need to be documented. J. Garvin noted that relocation of the Robert Armstrong House would have greater impacts than leaving it adjacent to I-93. K. Cota stated that one benefit of the new design is that the Robert Armstrong House could be left in place during construction of the new northbound, and it would be moved only once after the existing northbound bridge is removed. Though the connected barn of the Robert Armstrong House is more recent and not of concern, J. McKay stated that the ell connection is most likely integral to the original house. Since the roof is leaking, it should, if possible, be covered with a tarp before winter.

In reply to L. Wilson's inquiry as to where the Robert Armstrong would be relocated, P. Stamnas stated that there are still a couple of options. It could be placed near the proposed Park-and-Ride, on the relocated Range Road south of NH 111, or it could be integrated into the new Common Man Restaurant/office park site proposed by the owner, off Range Road to the east of the existing northbound I-93. B. O'Donnell stated that the MOA would need to be amended and the reasons for the renegotiation of the MOA documented. H. Kinter stated that the Windham Historic Commission is a Consulting Party and should be informed of the proposed changes.

L Wilson stated that both options had advantages and that NHDHR could work with either one. As they were currently defined, they followed the general intent of the MOA, the preservation and resale of the Robert Armstrong House.

Enfield 13185 (no federal number). Participant: Jon Evans.

J. McKay indicated that this project includes parts: a section of 4A northeast of the Mascoma Bridge previously identified as 13185B and the previously discussed "D" job, which is located on 4A in the Enfield Shaker Village National Register District. The B portion of the project begins approximately at the Lebanon-Enfield town line and runs approximately .9 miles to the southeast. Several potentially eligible properties are located adjacent to this portion of the project area. Alex Vogt indicated that it is anticipated that this project will be contained within the existing ROW. Much of the D portion of the project also lies within the right-of-way. There are three areas where the project extended a small amount outside the right-of-way and had been adjacent to buildings associated with the district, which are now removed. Testing found these areas to be disturbed. It was noted that there are two additional areas. A previous agreement noted that if construction contractors located archaeological deposits or building remains in these two areas, construction was to cease and qualified archaeologist would recover the data. E. Feighner requested that J. McKay monitor excavations in these two areas to determine if such deposits exist and whether recovery would be necessary.

It was agreed by all that this project would not affect historic properties, assuming that all work adjacent to the potentially eligible properties and the district would be contained within the existing ROW. Linda Wilson and Joyce McKay signed a No Adverse Effect Memo for the D job, and a No Historic Properties Affected Memo was signed for the B portion of the project.

Acworth 14540T (no federal number). Participants: Darrell Elliott.

This project involves the replacement of a 10 ft span jack-arch bridge with a 20 ft span bridge of undetermined specifications. The new bridge would be wider than the original as well. It was previously determined that the Jack-Arch bridge would not be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Although the work would be done within a historical district associated with South Acworth Village, there would be No Adverse Effect as long as the work occurs within the existing right of way. The committee would like to review this project again after a more final design has been adopted to ensure there are no additional impacts to historical resources.

Meredith (no project numbers): Participants: Scott Newnan, SEA and Grace Livergood, NHDES.

Scott Newnan of SEA Consultants and Grace Levergood, DES Dam Bureau, presented a proposal to reconstruct the Wicwas Dam located on Wicwas Lake in Meredith. The project will involve the replacement of the existing road culvert and the construction of a concrete trapezoidal weir that extends into the lake. The purpose of the project is to increase the discharge capacity of the dam in order to comply with State Dam Safety Regulations. Dam Safety files show that dam was in existence in 1937 and was constructed of stone and earth with a concrete upstream face. After reviewing the information provided, Edna Feigner stated that no historical properties would be affected and there would be no impacts. She requested that photos be taken after lake drawdown and during deconstruction of the existing road culvert to record what currently exists. SEA will draft a "No historical properties affected" memo that includes a request for photos and email this to J. McKay. The memo will be signed by NHDHR at the Dec 7, 2006 meeting.

Londonderry 13015 (no federal number). Participants: Joyce McKay and Jim Kirouac.

Although the project will occur within 25 feet of the Pleasant Cemetery fronting on NH Route 128, E. Feighner agreed that it would not impact burials associated with the cemetery. The area being impacted is considerably lower in elevation than the cemetery, which is fronted by a stone retaining wall. Because drainage for the project is being placed near the English barn on the Joseph Dicarolo property, vibrations from normal excavation and construction may impact the stability of its dry laid stone foundation. The barn lies just northwest of the NH Route 128 and Litchfield intersection. It appears to be construction on stone piers with stone in-fill. J. Garvin requested vibration monitoring including the completion of photographs on all four sides of the building before and after construction and the use of static rollers rather than vibratory rollers in front of the building. He indicated that high-density digital photographs would be acceptable.

Sanbornton 14443 (no federal number). Jim Bouchard and Bob Carter, TTG (Turner Group) and the Town of Sanbornton.

The H.L. Turner Group is preparing a design for drainage of sections of Upper Bay Road and Hunkins Pond Road, which improperly drain during significant rain events. Improper drainage causes the two roads to ice over during the winter. Both roads possess a prescriptive right-of-way. This is emergency work to be done before winter if possible. A larger, municipal project will reconstruct the two roads at a later date.

Work on Hunkins Pond Road will involve 1600 feet, and the Turner Group is proposing the construction or re-opening of drainage ditches and under-drains, construction of swales and catch basins, and the replacement of concrete culverts. At this time, the intent is not to reconstruct the roads. Upper Bay Road is constructed with a flat profile. Most of this work will restore the swales or create new ones. This portion of the project will reconstruct the crown of the road. The project area is adjacent to but does not include the Steel Hill Church and a farm that now functions as a bed and breakfast. The project will not affect the stone walls in front of either property.

It was determined that this low-impact project would have no adverse effect on the historic properties that may be present.

Summary of Project:

Action

Req'd	Item No.	Description
N/A	1.00	Purpose of meeting is to present the project – Phase One which is for proposed roadway and drainage improvements on Hunkins Pond Road and Upper Bay Road in Sanbornton to NH DOT Bureau of Environment, Cultural Resources joint meeting with New Hampshire Department of Historical Resources, and US Army Corps of Engineers for decision of cultural impact.
N/A	2.00	Project is NHDOT 14443 known as the Sanbornton “Y” project which includes Upper Bay Road, Bay Road, and Hunkins Pond Road.
N/A	2.01	All work to be done is within a “Prescriptive Right-of-Way” defined by stone walls and other physical evidence on the side of both roads.
N/A	3.00	Improvements to Hunkins Pond Road are to address immediate public safety hazard associated with poor drainage and location of groundwater percolating through roadway bed and deteriorated pavement surface

N/A	3.01	Work to start approximately 125 ft. north of Patterson Brook crossing, continuing 1550 north to approximately 150 ft. north of Wells Road.
N/A	3.02	Improvements include replacement of existing culverts, installation of underdrains, installation of one catch basin, and the construction of, or re-establishment of, drainage swales where appropriate.
N/A	4.0	Improvements to Upper Bay Road address poor drainage issues and degraded roadway cross-section which captures and ponds rainfall causing winter icing conditions.
N/A	4.01	Work to start on the north side of the intersection of Collieson road and Upper Bay, and continue 3000 ft. north to the south side of the intersection of Steele Hill Road and Upper Bay Road.
N/A	4.02	Improvements include replacement or installation of driveway culverts, installation of one new cross culvert, roadway reclamation, installation of geotextile, adjustment of road grade to allow for sheet flow to road edge, and adjustment of roadway profile to eliminate puddling of water in the travel lanes.
N/A	5.00	Historical integrity of farmhouse on Hunkins Pond Road is not jeopardized by project.
TTG	6.00	Stone walls are not to be touched during construction. TTG will necessitate this during construction.
N/A	7.00	The structural and aesthetic integrity of the Meeting House on Upper Bay Road will not be jeopardized by this project.
N/A	8.00	ACOE inquired about wetlands impacts. TTG noted that Oakhill Environmental has evaluated the corridors. Wetlands are present but contained beyond the physical boundaries for the ROW. Project is being structured to avoid impact to wetlands for this Phase.
N/A	8.01	ACOE inquired if replacement culverts on Hunkins Pond Road serve intermittent streams. TTG noted that culverts selected serve drainage purposes. TTG to further review with Oakhill Environmental Services

N/A	9.00	The joint committee meeting indicated that the Project had no adverse affect on cultural resources
-----	------	--

Portsmouth, BRF-X-0182(066), 10665. Participants: Bill Barry (wberry@vhb.com), Chris Baker, and Rita Walsh, VHB (rwalsh@vhb.com) and Charlie Hood.

Regarding potential archaeological resources, it was confirmed that sensitive areas at 653 Greenland Road, 566 Greenland Road, and 367 Greenland Road are out of the area of potential effect (APE) and require no Phase IB testing. For the Portsmouth Plains Park area, the City has decided against any work in the eastern portion, which was to have been an additional work effort during the Phase IB studies.

Edna Feighner recommended that Kathy Wheeler contact cemetery workers at Calvary Cemetery and interview them about any artifacts or features they may have encountered in the vicinity of the Globe Tavern. It appears that the Globe Tavern site may be fully within the grounds of the cemetery, so persons excavating modern graves may have some experience with artifacts. Chris Baker will supply K. Wheeler with contact information for the cemetery custodian at Calvary.

The Phase 1A study confirmed the archaeological sensitivity of the Plains Park area dating back to the late 17th century, when records were scarce and maps nonexistent. James Garvin stated that the small 17th-century village was destroyed in the 1690s massacre, and we have no information about the layout or number of homes in the Plains village. Archaeology may be the sole means by which to better understand this early Portsmouth settlement.

The archaeological effort will consist of interviewing cemetery workers about information pertaining to the Globe Tavern and Phase IB subsurface testing along the west and south sides of the "Plains" area as well as along the front of Calvary Cemetery to identify any remains from Globe Tavern in the project area.

This project is scheduled for adverting on November 9, 2007, but with the field season coming fast to a close, K. Wheeler stated she would begin the archaeological fieldwork in early spring 2007.

Relative to historic resources, no additional aboveground structures will require inventory work now that the City of Portsmouth has decided not to pursue the parking lot at Plains Park.

Green sheets for the previously inventoried structures are being drafted by NHDHR and are expected from Beth Muzzey shortly. These sheets will contain her recommendations regarding NR eligibility of the Sherbourne House (eligible under Criterion C, not A), Rt. 33 bridge over Eastern RR (both bridge and abutments are contributing structures to the eligible Eastern RR historic district), and St. Mary's Cemetery (NR eligible – reversal of earlier NHDHR opinion that cemetery was not eligible). Rita Walsh said she would contact Beth directly so that the inventory forms could be finalized.

Regarding the Rt. 33 bridge, the removal of bridge and abutments is an adverse effect and a Section 4(f) issue. Rita and Joyce McKay will deal with it via e-mail. The required Section 4(f) Evaluation will address both the potential recreational impacts at Plains Park and all historic impacts in one document. The bridge will be documented as a mitigation measure, but the specific details of this effort have not been decided.

The CE necessary for this project will require Edna Feighner's approval letter. There will be a full 4(f) for the project, related to impacts generated by the railroad bridge replacement and to the recreation areas.

Canterbury 14719 (No Federal Number). Participant: Jon Evans.

Darrel Elliott and Jon Evans began by explaining that this project involves the stabilization of approximately 500 feet of roadway embankment on West Road in Canterbury. It will also involve minor drainage updates, and all work will be contained within the existing right-of-way. This section of roadway is located adjacent to the Gold Star Sod Farm property owned by the Town of Canterbury. The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF) holds a Land & Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP) conservation easement on this property. LCHIP and SPNHF have indicated that all work must be contained within the existing ROW unless the full condemnation process is undertaken. In order to contain all impacts within the existing ROW a sheet pile option was chosen. This option requires metal sheets to be driven into the slope on the roadway side of the ROW to support the failing slope.

Several potentially historic properties have been identified at the bottom of the hill near the intersection of West Road and Intervale Road. It was agreed by Linda Wilson that these properties were potentially historic, and therefore it would be best to issue a Memorandum of No Adverse Effect.

Jon indicated that on November 8, 2006, the Department held a public information meeting and the current sheet pile method was met with much public resistance as it required roadway closure for a period of at least one month. Given this resistance, it is possible that the Department may revisit some of the other methods requiring entrance onto the LCHIP property. It was agreed that accessing this option would still qualify for a finding of No Adverse Effect. Jon indicated that the Department would update the group should the current design change.

Concord, X-A000(090), 13889 (Downtown Bus Shelters). Participant: Matt Walsh, City of Concord (mwalsh@onconcord.com) and Chris Carley, CN Carley Associates (CE Action Number: 28).

Mr. Chris Carley presented revised concepts for bus shelters located on east and west sides of North Main Street (between Capitol and Park Streets). These concepts incorporated comments from the Cultural Resources Meeting in September 2006.

N. Main Street / State House Plaza Concepts: Mr. Carley presented two slightly different concepts. Both concepts were slightly curved in shape and built from tubular steel with a barrel style roof. Both options provide seating on the "north" side of the structure. A space is provided for handicapped / wheel chair bound individuals. The rear (south side) of the structure does not feature bench seating, as this area is intended to allow for standing. The base of the structure is flared to provide stability as well as some privacy between the two sides of the structure. The key difference between the two options presented was roofing materials. One option suggested a semitransparent roof while the other called for a solid roof with copper colored metal.

The committee favored the overall design as presented and recommended the City pursue the “clear” roof option.

N. Main Street / East Side (Eagle Hotel): Mr. Carley presented two concepts. Both concepts were straight / rectangular designs and built from tubular steel. Both options provide seating on the “west” side of the structure. As with the State House Plaza concept, a space is provided for handicapped / wheel chair bound individuals. The rear (east side) of the structure does not feature bench seating, as this area is intended to allow for standing. Like the State House Plaza concept, the base of the structure is flared to provide stability as well as some privacy between the two sides of the structure. Further, the shelter featured a barrel shaped roof with two options for cladding: a semitransparent roof and solid roof with copper colored metal.

The committee favored the overall design as presented and recommended the City pursue the “clear” roof option.

They were pleased that both structures shared a common theme and vocabulary of materials. NHDHR recommended that a “Memorandum of No Adverse Effect” be issued for the project. The committee concurred.

Coordination with Native American Tribal Groups: Participants: Bill Hauser, Dennis Danna, Edna Feighner and Richard Roach.

Edna Feighner described the sessions she had attended on coordinating cultural resources review with American Indian tribes that was sponsored by the Army Corps of Engineers. It was noted that NHDOT now coordinates with the Abenaki in Swanton. The sessions by the Corps have indicated that coordination for New Hampshire should be on a broader basis, including groups in but not limited to Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. E. Feighner indicated that although there are no federal lands under jurisdiction of a federally recognized tribe and these groups no longer occupy land here, they may claim ancestry within New Hampshire’s borders and should be involved in review of Native American resources. E. Feighner suggested that both FHWA and the Army Corps host a get-together with Native American groups to discuss the form of coordination. She will compose a list of groups that should be contacted. Bill O’Donnell stated that he would contact Mary Ann Naber for guidance on this issue. It was suggested that copies of agendas might be sent as well as sending archaeological reports that include discussions of sites with a Native American presence.

Portsmouth, BHF-X-T-0101(015), 13678. Participant: Bill Hauser, Nancy Mayville and Kevin Nyhan, NHDOT; Joe Grilli and Addie Kim, HNTB; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Co., and Mike Johnson, Maine Historical Commission.

The purpose of this meeting was to present the preferred alternative for the Memorial Bridge project that has been approved by the Commissioner’s office and to review the cultural resource effects and mitigation of the alternative on the National Register-eligible Memorial Bridge Historic District.

Nancy Mayville reviewed the status of the alternatives selection. The NHDOT had proposed to replace the lift span of the Memorial Bridge, since lift span rehabilitation is not viable due to the condition of the bottom chord. The last time that the Cultural Resources group met, the modified

in-kind replacement alternative for the lift span had been presented. This alternative involved replicating the historic look of the bridge, with laced members on the new lift span. The bottom chord, which would be out of sight, would be a box steel beam, the verticals would be laced, and the deck would be of modern-type construction. The initial differences in agreement related to the need to replicate in kind the sway bracing and the lateral braces at the top (upper lateral bracing). This alternative to replicate the sway and upper lateral bracing, at an additional cost of roughly \$2.5 million, was presented to the NHDOT Commissioner's office and Maine DOT, and formal approval to include this in the preferred alternative was granted in early October.

Joyce McKay stated that, now that concurrence on the preferred alternative has been received, the effects sheets need to be reviewed and completed. Linda Wilson indicated that the effect sheets summarize the determination of eligibility information, effects, and mitigation. She distributed draft effects sheets for collective review and revisions. The elements of the Memorial Bridge Historic District were considered both collectively and as individual components, as well as the effects to the Portsmouth historic district, which has never been formally defined. The effects sheets were prepared for:

- Memorial Bridge (lift span and tower/flanking spans), Portsmouth, NH and Kittery, ME
- Scott Avenue Bridge, Portsmouth, NH
- Memorial Park in Portsmouth, NH
- Badger's Island Bridge, Kittery, ME
- John Paul Jones Memorial Park, Kittery, ME
- Maine approach span to Memorial Bridge
- Memorial Bridge Historic District, Portsmouth, NH and Kittery, ME
- Portsmouth National Register Historic District

Linda Wilson reviewed the effects sheets for these components, proceeding from north in Maine to south in New Hampshire.

Linda Wilson indicated that the form for the Badger's Island Bridge indicates that there is no effect, no Section 4(f) review, and no mitigation required. It was discussed that no changes to the form are needed. (The Badger's Island Bridge was constructed later than the Memorial Bridge and is non-contributing to the historic significance of the Memorial Bridge Historic District.)

Bill Hauser suggested adding a concurrence line on the forms for signature by the Maine Historic Preservation Commission (MHPC). Joyce McKay indicated that the Effects Memo and Memorandum of Agreement, two different documents, would also be drafted for signature by MHPC, incorporating their comments. Mike Johnson indicated that he had no issues with signing the memoranda and would look at the final plans. It was discussed that work would be performed within the existing pavement at Badger's Island and that MHPC had previously indicated that there was no need for further archaeological investigations in Maine. Joyce McKay requested that HNTB send plans of the discussion today to the MHPC.

For the John Paul Jones Memorial Park, Linda Wilson stated that the effects sheet indicates no effect, no 4(f), and no mitigation required.

Linda Wilson presented the form for the Maine approach span, which indicates that there is an effect on setting, but "otherwise adverse effect may be considered not adverse," and no mitigation is required. The form states that documentation materials that already have been completed (including the Historic Structures Report and large format photos) are sufficient. The current modification in-kind design also reduces the effects on the Maine approach span.

Linda Wilson reviewed the form for the Memorial Bridge Historic District, including the lift span and flanking tower spans. This form indicates that the district includes the Maine approach span at least to the southernmost pier of the Maine approach span and possibly the entire Route 1 transportation corridor to Government Street in Kittery. The district includes the memorial parks, the Scott Avenue Bridge, the Memorial Bridge, the Maine approach spans, and the road connecting the Maine approach span to the Badger's Island Bridge. The draft effects form indicates that there is an adverse effect on the district, but that no mitigation is required, in addition to that for the Memorial Bridge, Scott Avenue Bridge, Memorial Park, and the Portsmouth National Register Historic District. Bill Hauser questioned the wording on the form that no mitigation is required for the district. Linda Wilson indicated that the mitigation is specified on forms for individual components, and no additional mitigation is required, but this phrasing will be revised on the district's effects form. It was agreed that the Environmental Study Report would address mitigation needed for the district in its entirety.

Linda Wilson reviewed the form for the Scott Avenue Bridge on the Portsmouth approach, which states that this bridge on the southern Memorial Bridge approach has independent significance. There will be an adverse effect on the Scott Avenue Bridge, as the span will be removed and replaced. Mike Johnson inquired whether the adverse effect on the Memorial Bridge Historic District is in part attributable to the adverse effect on the Scott Avenue Bridge, and this was confirmed. There was discussion regarding the phrasing that: "Lighting design should be developed in consultation with the City of Portsmouth lighting standards, and if possible, reflect the appearance of the acorn-type lighting shown in historic photos of the bridge." It was agreed that this phrasing would be revised to refer to consultation with the city, rather than referencing the city's standard. The effects form also states that: "the goal for the new railing is to achieve a feeling of openness; choice of railing shall be made in consultation between NHDOT, FHWA, NHDHR, and the City of Portsmouth."

Linda Wilson reviewed the form for Memorial Park. It was mentioned that the park was first determined eligible for the National Register in 2004, as a component of the Scott Avenue Bridge. There will be an effect on the park setting, which will be considered a no adverse effect subject to mitigation. Jim Garvin indicated that lighting contiguous to Scott Avenue and the park should be acorn-type fixtures. It was stated that the historic lighting that should be replicated, if possible, is shown on page M-66 of the Historic Structures Report. Archaeological monitoring is proposed during geotechnical explorations and during construction for excavations below 4 feet in depth. The hope was expressed that the park would be returned to a design similar to the one now extant or an earlier design, but recognized that the City would have additional input into the design.

Linda Wilson reviewed the form for the Portsmouth National Register Historic District. No official Determination of Eligibility form has been prepared for the district, but it was determined that the district is clearly eligible for listing, even though the boundaries are unclear. The project is deemed to have an adverse effect on the district. Mitigation is listed on the form as including restoring Memorial Park to its current or previous configuration. Nancy Mayville indicated that the city would like to change entrances in the area of the park to improve traffic safety and are also planning a memorial to Martin Luther King in the park. It was discussed that, last time the city was consulted on their plans for the park memorial, plans had not been developed beyond the concept stage. The effects sheets should take into account the city's plans for this site, and the city and NHDHR should be consulted in the design of the post-construction park layout. Mitigation is also listed as including an interpretive exhibit commemorating the Memorial

Bridge, J.A.L. Waddell, and the vertical lift bridges as a bridge type. Again, the current project design also mitigates this impact.

Linda Wilson reviewed the form for the Memorial Bridge (lift span and tower/flanking spans). Mark Richardson commented on wording regarding “low operation and maintenance costs,” and it was agreed that this would be reworded. The Scott Avenue summary description is repeated under the Memorial Bridge.

The summary description of cultural resources also describes Native American and Euro-American archaeology. Linda Wilson noted that IAC had found disturbance to a depth of 4 feet through mechanical trenching in memorial park at the western end of the project area. If project disturbance goes below that level at the west end or expands beyond areas clearly disturbed by the construction of the existing bridge at the east end near the shore line, archaeological monitoring during construction will be necessary. Clear provisions for monitoring and the construction delays necessary to accommodate data recovery will need to be made in the contract. IAC has already conducted trenching in the only accessible area available.

The form for the Memorial Bridge summarizes effects on each component of the historic district of the two main alternatives: lift span replacement and lift span rehabilitation. The rehabilitation was deemed to have no adverse effect on the Memorial Bridge Lift Span. The replacement alternative was considered to have an adverse effect on the Memorial Bridge Lift Span and Tower/Flanking Spans and an adverse effect on the Portsmouth National Register Historic District. The impact here is adverse, but much reduced by the current design for the lift span. Because of the need to replace the eligible Scott Avenue Bridge, the effects on this resource are also adverse. Addie Kim inquired whether, for the purposes of NEPA and 4(f), the discussion would focus on the major alternatives (no build, rehabilitation, lift span replacement modified, lift span replacement in kind) and broach treatment of the range of alternatives considered under Section 106. Bill O'Donnell indicated that other alternatives that were considered but dismissed would be covered in the history section, but not as major alternatives in the 4(f) and or in the Environmental Study Report documents.

Mitigation for the Memorial Bridge replacement was discussed as including HAER documentation. Bill Hauser inquired about the Historic Structures Report as HAER documentation. It was discussed that this report was intended to serve as HAER documentation and would be updated to reflect the consultation held since the document was prepared and additional alternatives considered. This document includes most if not all of the necessary large format photographs.

Jim Garvin raised the issue of the interpretive exhibit in Prescott Park, and it was agreed that the wording in the effects memo should allow for a location other than Prescott Park, in the event that permission is not granted to use the park for this purpose. Negotiations with the Trustees of Prescott Park will be needed to gain permission to locate the exhibit in Prescott Park. Nancy Mayville indicated that the sign could be placed in Memorial Park, if needed. Lynne Monroe suggested that the exhibit could alternatively be placed under the bridge within the right-of-way, where there is a vantage point along the waterfront.

Steve Liakos raised the issue of the need for drainage improvements, which may warrant additional archaeological investigation, since the condition of the existing drainage system is not well known. Nancy Mayville indicated that a provision could be inserted into the contract if drainage improvements are needed.

In summary, mitigation discussed for the Memorial Bridge project is as follows:

1. The revised Historic Structures Report bringing the project up to the current agreements with the large format photos including those that were overlooked, i.e. of the original design sheets.
2. An outdoor, interpretive panel exhibit, of about 3 panels covering the history of the bridge, the significance of the bridge type and the work of Waddell. It would include illustrations-line and photos. Another proposal may include simply a state historic marker.
3. Professional photos of the Memorial Bridge being replaced.
4. All necessary phases of archaeology including any currently unplanned drainage.
5. Consultation with the City about design elements such as lighting, bridge rail, and the Memorial Park design.
6. The current modified in-kind replacement of the lift span.

Nancy Mayville indicated that the NHDOT is getting the project ready as part of its 10-year plan and would like to have the project on the shelf ready for bid as soon as possible. Linda Wilson indicated that revising the effects sheets was a clerical matter, now that consensus had been reached on the effects/mitigation.

Lebanon, 13491, STP-TE-X-5253(009). Participants: Charlie Hood and Joyce McKay.

Charlie Hood presented a municipally managed TE project involving bicycle and pedestrian improvements along US 4 near exit 19 of I-89. It begins at NU Bridge and continues east 7000 feet in the NHDOT right-of-way within an area called the Miracle Mile. C. Hood explained that the area is primarily occupied by an area of commercial and light industrial establishments. J. Garvin noted that NU Bridge has not been found eligible for the National Register, but was treated as such for a recent municipally managed project that rehabilitated the bridge but did not adversely affect it. While NHDHR agreed that the project did not have an adverse effect, E. Feighner indicated that if the project went outside the right-of-way, it might be necessary to complete all necessary phases of archaeology.

Bartlett 14372 (no federal number). Participants: Steve Liakos.

Bill O'Donnell reviewed the list of mitigation measures suggested by Jim Garvin for a scenario that would remove the Bartlett Bridge. Mark Richardson thought that the bridge preservation plan should not be tied to the removal of the bridge. J. Garvin stated that each of the points involved in the cooperative development of a bridge preservation plan, the primary focus of the requested mitigation, had been discussed with the front office in the past. He suggested this list as a way out of the current impasse. L. Wilson and J. Garvin stated that this project was something more than the typical record and demolish scenario.

It was noted that individuals at the Public Information Meeting generally supported the preservation of the bridge except for the selectmen. However, the letters that followed mostly supported its removal. J. Garvin noted that public input should not be treated as a vote, but their

expressions of concern should be weighed individually. There are certainly individuals nationally that would like the bridge to remain.

Linda Wilson indicated that such a preservation plan did not have to be tied to the mitigation of the Bartlett Bridge, but NHDHR would then be looking for a separate MOU that listed the elements in the proposed mitigation that applied to completing the preservation plan and included a stewardship commitment. It was noted that Commissioner Murray had suggested that a Historic Bridge Authority be created to deal with this issue.

B. O'Donnell acknowledged that a defensible 4(f) statement would be difficult to prepare. He requested that Mark Hemmerlein craft the 4(f) argument and provide FHWA with a draft for review by the division. It will also need to be reviewed for legal sufficiency at FHWA and then by DOI.

Roxbury-Sullivan, F-X-0121 (034), 10439. Participant: Don Lyford and Marc Laurin.

D. Lyford presented the recent discussions he has had with the new owner of 439 Valley Road on parcel 20 (Inventory # 15, previously owned by Murrin). His septic failed during the flooding of Otter Brook, and replacement was proving to be difficult. The Town of Sullivan will not allow the septic system to be replaced in its existing location because it is too close to Otter Brook. J. McKay stated that this property, though not individually eligible, contributes to the East Sullivan Village Historic District. D. Lyford stated that a hearing may be held in late 2007, but construction would not occur until 2014. The Department has several options for the reconstruction of the NH Route 9 bridge spanning Otter Brook and may have to acquire some of this property. He asked about the required mitigation if the property were to be acquired and the house removed since it would not have an approved septic. J. Garvin stated that the house would require documentation and marketing for removal. If it were not purchased, it could then be demolished. J. McKay would prepare the covenant and marketing language that would be required for the purchase of the house. B. Hauser and B. O'Donnell stated that documentation would be required to evaluate 4(f) issues and show that there would be no other prudent or feasible alternative than its purchase. D. Lyford asked if it could be purchased with State funds only. L. Wilson said that there would be Section 110 concerns, a Federal agency could not participate in the future project if a historic resources had been endangered to accommodate the project. That might constitute anticipatory demolition. B. O'Donnell stated that if there is a demonstrated hardship to the owner, the State could buy the property and make the necessary improvement, so it could be resold. B. Hauser stated that the State would need to be willing to buy the property with the risk that it may not be required for the project. D. Lyford would consider the options.

****Memos:** Enfield 13185B/D; Bath-Landaff 13427 (no federal number); Bartlett, BRZ-032-1(09), 14372; Hinsdale, X-A000(426), 14540N;

Other projects may also be reviewed.

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager
S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\06minutes\11-2-9.doc

